DCCUMENT RESUBE

ED 153 947 SP 012 355

AUTHOR Dickson, George E.
TITLE The University cf Tcledc Ccmpetency-Based Teacher Education and Individually Guided Education Program.
INSTITUTION Toledo Univ., Ohic. Ccll. cf Edtcatich.
PUB DATE 22 Feb 78
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Interraticral Management Training for Educaticral Charge Meeting (Gaustblikk, Norway, Decembter 4-11, 1976); fcr related dccument, see SP012 354

EDBS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Pcstage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Educaticnal Cbjectives; Higher Education; *Individualized Instructicr; Crganizational Development; *Performance Based Teacher Educatich; *Prcgram Descripticns; Program Development; *Teacher Centers
IDENTIFIERS *University cf Tcledc CH

ABSTRACT

The cooperative program fcr ccmpetency-based teacher education (CBTE) and individually guided educatich (IGE) cperating in the Tcledo, Ohic, area is described. Planning, develcpment, design, and redesign processes of the program (which inveclves the University of Toledo, and public and private schccls ir the district) are surveyed. Nineteen forces operating tc prcmcte change in instructional practices and eleven cperating tc hinder change are listed. A survey of the past history of the prcgram prcvides a background for ccnstructing future scerarics. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDBS are the best that can be made *
* from the original dccument. *
****

ED153947

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION AND INDIVIDUALLY GUIDED EDUCATION PROGRAM*

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
TOLEDO, OHIO

FEBRUARY 22, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
George E. Dickson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

*This paper was originally written for and presented at the International Management Training for Educational Change Meeting which was held in Gaustblikk, Norway on December 4-11, 1976.

SP012 355

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER

EDUCATION/INDIVIDUALLY GUIDED EDUCATION PROGRAM

Background[1]

The model teacher education program produced at The University of Toledo is an attempt to bring the University, the public and parochial schools with which it cooperates, and the community into various coalitions that function cooperatively in a preservice and inservice teacher training program. A comprehensive educational reform-renewal stratey has been developed for a city, a region, and their educational institutions. It has involved a systems approach and modeling in developing, organizing, and operationalizing a considerable change effort. The basic organizing elements in the program system are the development of individually guided education (IGE) which involved the creation of multiunit schools (a differentiated staffing, team teaching, etc., concept developed at the Wisconsin R and D Center for Cognitive Learning) and competency-based teacher education (CBTE). These elements are effectively linked together to create a climate for and the support of a strategy for massive educational change. It is a total effort to deal with educational complexity by considering all components in the educational process with the result of producing educational change and benefits for learners in elementary schools, secondary schools, and university teacher education programs.

The fundamental effort has been (1) to produce teacher behaviors that can be identified and then, eventually, to test and prove them relevant by establishing the relationships of such behavior with pupil behavior and outcomes and (2) to create and facilitate an effective, positive learning environment and school operation conducive to the well-being of all children. In this design the University has primary responsibility for the preservice training for potential teachers and for the inservice training of its own faculty. The schools associating with the program have joint responsibility

---

[1]The entire history and development of the Toledo CBTE/IGE system operating in the Toledo area under the guidance of the College of Education, The University of Toledo and with the cooperation of six school districts including the Toledo Public Schools, is much too voluminous to be presented in this paper. The complete, detailed discussion of the entire system is available in a book by George E. Dickson and Richard W. Saxe, et al., Partners for Educational Reform and Renewal (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973). Other publications have also carried the Toledo story as indicated in the attached bibliography. The most comprehensive source is the volume indicated above.

with the University for the inservice education of its teachers and administrators. All target populations in the model program are involved in extensive field work both in the schools and in the community with the basic goal of relating all educational systems to the larger social system.

The change model which has been created and implemented is a successful combination of educational programs, institutions, personnel and facilities. A teacher education center has been created as a teacher education laboratory and integrating unit for a variety of preservice and inservice teacher education activities. Such activities result in a process for the improvement of teacher competency involving the use of behavioral objectives, individualization of instruction, program modularization, the use of competency-based criteria, and a continuous feedback and evaluation system.

The program has been designed with the fundamental assumption that teachers and the children they teach must be prepared for a world of rapid change. Such a concept requires a continuing educational process for all persons (students, teachers and administrators), in all types of educational institutions involved with teacher preparation. All such elements or target populations in the educational system are given appropriate and adequate training or re-training to prepare persons for the schools of the future. Such schools are conceived as those (1) utilizing the individually guided education (IGE) concept, (2) using modern technological and media innovations, (3) applying behavior modification as well as appropriate practices dictated by developmental psychology, (4) requiring an awareness of and attention to cultural differences existing in society today, and (5) helping teachers assess and modify their own teaching behavior and style. The goals of education and teacher education have been considered congruent. We acknowledge the responsibility of being partners with public and private schools (those that wish to join us) in educational change efforts.

Our comprehensive efforts at The University of Toledo to change teacher education, preservice and inservice, as well as to introduce concomitant educational change efforts in elementary and secondary schools began in the academic year of 1967-68. In that year, we concurrently operated dual projects to (1) design a competency-based teacher education program and (2) to introduce the concept of individually guided education and multiunit schools to the Toledo area. By 1973, the College was operating a fully developed CBTE program as well as completely participating in the Toledo area Metropolitan League of Multiunit Schools which involved, by that date, six participating school districts and 15 multiunit schools. The entire effort was linked together in a single, comprehensive plan to bring about educational change (1) in the way teachers were prepared and (2) in the schools where these

teachers would likely teach. The general idea was that any effort to change teacher education should also result in the change in the schools where our teacher education students would practice and teach. Such thinking required certain things of the teacher training process. Most importantly, the program was heavily field-based to bring school and classroom reality to teacher preparation. The broad goals of teacher education had to be clear and firm so that our success in accomplishing them could be demonstrated, making us more accountable for our efforts. The broad goals were broken down into manageable instructional (behavioral) objectives. Such objectives specified the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values (competencies) needed by teachers. A curriculum for teacher training was created which would meet the known individual differences of learners through individualizing and personalizing the instructional process. Teacher education students had the opportunity to meet a number of common educational objectives but all would not meet them in the same way or in the same amount of time. There was definite stress on assessment, evaluation procedures.

Since 1973, the program has been in a state of constant refinement. To accomplish this, a number of internal and external evaluation efforts have been initiated. These have involved formative and summative evaluation procedures conducted by University faculty with the aid of graduate assistants. Further, a number of external evaluators have visited the institution to offer analysis and recommendations. Evaluation has been on-going and is continuing. A large evaluation design has been developed for future implementation which will ultimately attempt to determine the relationship between the teacher behaviors produced in the teacher education program and their impact on pupil performance and outcomes.

The decision-making structure for the total program consists of a system-wide policy committee called the Teacher Education Policy and Advisory Committee (TEPAC) which oversees the entire program and recommends program policies. Under this committee operates a Team Leaders Council composed of the team leaders of the instructional teams providing course instruction in the program. This Council solves day-to-day logistical and administrative problems as well as provides evaluation of the effectiveness of team plans. Each course in the program is team taught with a team leader elected by the members of each team. Teaching teams plan the activities and instructional efforts to be provided in each course under the modules allocated to the course. Some members of teaching teams also serve as "facilitators" who are assigned to cooperating, participating schools in which students are assigned for field experiences. Facilitators are responsible for assisting and evaluating the students placed in a school as well as providing inservice consultation to principals and teachers. The foregoing management structure is subject to the operations and actions of regular college administrators and the legislation of college faculty.

Support for the project has been forthcoming from regular funds appropriated to the College of Education for undergraduate instructional purposes and from federal and foundation funding. The College of Education has received approximately $500,000 additional, outside funding for the implementation of its competency-based/individually guided education teacher education program.

Change Analysis

It is relatively easy to create and develop educational innovations but such creation does not result in educational change unless effective strategies are developed for the implementation of the change. The accomplishment of innovative change in education appears to center on the process of implementation. It was clear from the beginning that University of Toledo efforts to change teacher education were not solved by having a model teacher education design. We had to find means for potential users of the design to become involved with it and the processes it delineated. Our implementation strategy was based on the premise that people in general, and educators in particular, would help support innovation or change if they believed that they were in some way responsible for the change.

The implementation strategy became one of getting all faculty members (as well as students) who were interested in teacher education change to organize and conduct the necessary effort to implement the original Ohio elementary teacher education model. This effort not only involved the implementation and revision of the original elementary teacher education model design but also included the creation of a secondary teacher education model which was based on the principles used in the elementary design project.

The initial involvement of faculty with the original design came from having a number of such persons on the original project team and the employment of others in various tasks required of the design and feasibility projects prior to implementation efforts. Thus, a good number of the faculty who were ultimately to be involved with the implementation process were original contributors to the two projects preceding this process. The first implementation efforts began with a series of meetings with faculty members. From these was developed a process model for program development. This process model was a simple input-process-output system emphasizing the task description of various groups of individuals assigned to various system components. The basic effort was the developing, modifying, or eliminating of the then existing educational specifications of the original design and the creating of modules that would become the instructional packages for the program. The modules required sequencing, yearly placement, course credit hours, with all of this coordinated into a total program.

The process system for the Toledo model development-implementation was put into operation Fall quarter, 1970. At first, all went reasonably well and according to plan. But as time went on problems of one type or another arose that ultimately resulted in a modification of the process for moving College personnel toward model implementation and operation. The lesson was learned and relearned that no system is fixed or complete in its conception and operation. All systems have to remain constantly modifiable and adaptable to external conditions, inner concerns, and feedback.

The first modification of the development-implementation system involved the replacement of two of the original process system's groups with one committee called System Process Coordinators. These coordinators, consisting of three key department chairmen in the Curriculum and Instruction Division, reorganized process groups into two basic units--elementary and secondary program developmental-implementation teams. The systems coordinators succeeded in bringing together faculty, students and school personnel for proper programmatic effort which resulted in the production of the basic modules for both the elementary and secondary CBTE programs.

The further internalization of the development-implementation process occurred when the systems process coordinators (who operated for approximately two years) were replaced with a new version of the process system called, The College Instructional Improvement Committee. The growth of the program in terms of modules and courses being offered on a more regular rather than an experimental format coupled with program demands of budget, personnel, supervision, assignment, etc., became overriding concerns. The systems process coordinators could not handle these because the College still operated under its traditional department/division organization and they were finding themselves more frequently in conflict with other department chairmen and divisional directors over program and personnel matters. The systems coordinators did not have the final authority to handle all budgetary and personnel problems. As the CBTE program gained form and substance it was necessary to involve those individuals who did have such authority more closely with CBTE implementation.

The continued solution to implementation concerns was the creation of the College Instructional Improvement Committee (CIIC) with department chairmen and division directors as committee members along with instructional team leaders and other persons having administrative authority. This brought together in the development-implementation effort all of those involved in leadership positions. The College Instructional Improvement Committee worked successfully until late Spring, 1975. Then, because of a pressing need to have an expanded representation from schools on

such a committee, the CIIC was reorganized into the Teacher Education Advisory and Policy Committee (TEPAC) bringing as much representation from the field as there was College-based membership.

The foregoing has briefly explained the coordination-planning process in a process model for program development and implementation. Within this process has been the creation of several ad hoc committees and one permanent committee. The ad hoc committees have consisted of an assessment and evaluation committee, a revision and planning committee, and a module realignment committee consisting of three task forces. The permanent committee has been the development of what is known as Team Council. Team Council consists of the elected members of each instructional team involved in the program plus departmental and division chairmen and student representatives. The Team Council handles day-by-day program operations and serves as a general low-level administrative body for the program.

The development and implementation of the competency-based teacher education program has been a system of successive approximations of the original ideal design. As we develop, we implement; as we implement, we develop. Implementation is a process of successively approximating a more nearly ideal CBTE program. Program development and implementation efforts in such an operation are never finished. What we now describe as our CBTE elementary and secondary program is that particular program currently in existence. What the program becomes one, two, and five years from now will represent our continued efforts to approach the ideal as we respond to a changing society. The basic strategy to overcome program difficulties in decision-making and the general implementation process has been the continuous modification of the development-implementation process system.

There have been a number of major forces for change as well as those against change. These are indicated below in the respective columns labeled Forces for Change and Forces Against Change:

Forces For Change	Forces Against Change
1. The program is conceptually and logically developed, carefully planned and well organized.	1. A CBTE program makes more specific the need of as well as difficulty in specifying the minimum criterion levels for teacher competency. Are the proper knowledge, skills and attitudes being developed by the students preparing to become teachers?
2. The use of some of the decade's most important, exciting, individual educational concepts: CBTE, teaching centers, and IGE/MUS. Merging such innovations makes them even more powerful as they become inseparable.	

Forces For Change

3. The combination of preservice training and inservice training in a competency-based model makes for a powerful programmatic effort in educational change.

4. The teacher education program basically models teaching by "doing" rather than "telling." This provides an effective incentive for learning. Teacher education students learn about team teaching, differentiated staffing, modularized and individualized instructional methods, the use of behavioral objectives, etc., in a program which forces "doing" and the modeling of an instructional team approach which students can carry over to classroom teaching situations.

5. The lack of program rigidity, opportunity for greater questioning, increased openness, more concern for students as individuals, high spirits, greater intellectual expectations of students and faculty--all this is not proof that it's better teacher education, but such a conclusion seems inescapable.

6. The use of a strong systemic approach to the program which includes feedback for error correction enables continuous program development and reaction to change.

7. The processes for student assessment and program revision appear well conceived and operated.

Forces Against Change

2. The psychological frame of reference for CBTE can tend to be too narrow; for example, there can be too much emphasis on behavior modification. This phenomenon can also occur in other broad discipline areas.

3. Continuous module restructuring, sequencing, revision and realignment either undertaken unknown to others by individual faculty or knowingly by authorized procedures is upsetting to program continuity and stability and can result in program "gaps."

4. Although the program is labeled as competency-based and organized and operated in this mode, evidence thus far suggests that not all graduates of such a program are totally competent.

5. The Toledo team and program operations conflict with long-time traditions in higher education: clear departmental boundaries, agreed upon academic jurisdiction, bureaucratic behavior based on rank, "academic freedom," etc.

6. The time and effort committed by the faculty to the program is considerable and difficult. The faculty has consistently felt overworked and such a feeling causes questioning of the individual faculty efforts/results ratio.

Forces For Change

8. The strong, built-in, working and cooperative relationship with various school districts and state and national agencies permits a strong field base for the program.

9. Procedures have been established for teachers and administrators in the school districts participating in the program to have a real voice in program development and policy. The program is consciously building basic professional and critical support beyond the university.

10. There is a definite correlation between the program and its objectives and the new State of Ohio Standards for Institutions Preparing Teachers in that both have a performance-based nature and call for a strong field component, systematic planning and management of instruction, and the use of a variety of instructional strategies.

11. The program is strongly supported by the State of Ohio Department of Education, United States Office of Education, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, cooperating school systems, and the University and College administration.

12. The opportunity to develop an assessment program or evaluation procedure that will indicate whether a well-developed CBTE program produces teachers who are, upon graduation, genuinely superior in their ability to promote student learning as constrasted with those that come out of more traditional programs. Further, there is

Forces Against Change

7. The program opens more than usual opportunities for faculty concerns, problems, and alienation over an interdisciplinary approach, teaming, and communication difficulties.

8. The continuous feedback provided by a CBTE system constantly reveals program weaknesses more than it reveals program successes. As the program operators make program progress such feedback, stressing negative matters, make faculty operators of the program more unhappy and uneasy.

9. The wide use of committees and team effort in the program have the effect of blurring areas of program and personal responsibility. Lines of authority through traditional departments and/or divisions conflict with new lines of authority as established by such operations as Team Council and TEPAC. The continuous question of who is exactly accountable for what continues as a basic concern for the well-being of the program.

10. Although there have been various types of evaluation efforts mounted, most of these have been relatively limited and have resulted in little more than the accumulation of faculty, student, or consultant opinion concerning the program. Hard data must be collected on the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the products

Forces For Change

a compelling need for demonstrated relationships between preservice teacher behaviors and pupil learning outcomes. The demand for such research-evaluation grows daily. The operational base for important research on teacher effectiveness and CBTE is available.

13. The energy, concern, sensitiveness, intelligence and quality of the faculty are positive forces for change. Faculty commitment is high. Good people make any program work.

14. Students are basically satisfied with the program.

15. The faculty and administration generally believe the program is improving and is a better form of teacher education.

16. The program has strong leadership from key administrators and faculty.

17. There is considerable opportunity for faculty to publish (concerning the CBTE program) including the creation of books and journals in which to do so.

18. Program operational funding is adequate.

19. Program concepts and operations have survived over a considerable period of time, 1968-76.

Forces Against Change

produced in the program (teacher knowledge, skills and behavior) as measured by pupil behavior and outcomes. This type of research-evaluation will be most difficult to begin and conduct. Without such evidence of program validity, the innovation will ultimately decline and may face discontinuation.

11. The funds for the full research-evaluation effort needed have not yet been forthcoming.

Strategy Design

The future of The University of Toledo comprehensive program for educational change is interesting to contemplate. Most importantly, the Toledo program has not been a preoccupation with a limited aspect of change in education. All persons involved with the program, both from the university and schools, are concerned with the whole of education, and all have been involved in a total educational change process. The marriage of a competency-based approach to education and individually guided education/multiunit schools, plus a teacher center serving as a coordinating, materials and resource service, is a highly ambitious, creative, and comprehensive venture. However, with such effort there has been flexibility and procedures for objective feedback to ensure program self-correction and improvements. All persons involved know that what has been developed and implemented will not remain the same year after year; education must be a changing, self-renewing process. We are convinced that our strategy for preparing educational personnel and modifying the educational process has considerable potential for not only our geographical area of service but for other colleges and schools who may wish to adopt or adapt operations similar to ours.

One of the best methods of looking into the future is to take a brief look backward to see what has occurred. The program has survived since 1970 and there is no indication that such survival will not continue. Key personnel who were involved in the development of the program have left the institution but this has not lessened program prospects for continuance. Although the program asks and demands considerable effort and sacrifice from faculty, faculty are continuing to provide the work needed and there is no indication that they would abandon nearly eight years of educational progress. The schools in which we cooperatively live and work continue supportive of our efforts and, likewise, do not wish to abandon the educational gains they have witnessed and of which they have been a part. The heavy field experience emphasis of the program is exceedingly well received by cooperating school personnel. Financially, the program is on a sound base with only one basic financial need which cannot be supplied through University funds. This need is for a comprehensive evaluation-validation effort to determine if the program has a decided advantage in developing positive relationships between teacher behavior and pupil behavior and outcomes. The search for funds to conduct this evaluation continues. Such research/evaluation will be carried on piecemeal if it cannot be approached globally. The national and international visibility of the program is a strong force for program continuation. The faculty and persons associated with the program gain considerable positive exposure from their association and work with it. Further, the opportunity for and amount of faculty publication has been considerable. Because of these and other related reasons, abandonment of the program is virtually unthinkable. Instead, the search for solutions to new problems continues as former problems are solved. The program structure

and process makes this possible. Living and working with the program is a matter of reacting to continuous change.

If there is any future program modification it will likely be in the direction of improving the model rather than abandoning it. Because of the comprehensive nature of the change and the full involvement of so many people with it, continuous, positive revision continues to be the most likely prospect. The fundamental strategy for continuous change is built into the program system which constantly works toward ensuring its continuance in some form. One thing is certain, the College of Education at The University of Toledo will never again be the same organization or operation it once was due to its eight years of involvement with the innovations of competency-based education, individually guided education/multiunit schools, and teacher centers.

Bibliography

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS ON COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION AND RELATED SUBJECTS BY UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO FACULTY

Books

Anderson, Dan. W., James M. Cooper, M. Vere DeVault, George E. Dickson, Charles E. Johnson and Wilford A. Weber, (eds.) Competency Based Teacher Education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973.

Dickson, George E., Richard W. Saxe et al. Partners for Educational Reform and Renewal: Competency-Based Teacher Education, Individually Guided Education, and Multi-Unit Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973.

Ishler, Richard E. A section of a chapter describing The University of Toledo's CBTE program in Competency-Based Education. A Process for the Improvement of Education, by Howard Jones & Gene Hall (eds.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Leonard, Leo D. and Robert T. Utz. Building Skills for Competency Based Teaching. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.

Nussel, Edward J., Joan D. Inglis, and William Wiersma. IGE for the Teacher. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishers, 1976.

Utz, Robert T., and Leo D. Leonard, Social Foundations and Competency Based Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1975.

Wiersma, William, Stephen Jurs. Measurement and Evaluation in IGE. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishers, 1976.

Booklets or Monographs

Dickson, George E. A Case Study for Educational Reform and Renewal: Competency Based Teacher Education, Individually Guided Education and Multiunit Schools. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1973.

Dickson, George E. "Competency-Based Teacher Education: Its Characteristics, Origins, and Potential," Revista de Educacion, Ano 23, No. 241 (Madrid, Spain: Ministerio de Educacion y Ciencia, Nov.-Dec. 1975). pp. 24-44.

Dickson, George E. (ed.) Educational Comment I/1975, Research and Evaluation in Operational Competency-Based Teacher Education Programs. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1975.

Dickson, George E. "The Future of CBTE," Topics in Teacher Education, Proceedings of the Second National Conference on Teacher Education. (Bloomington, Indiana: School of Education, Indiana University, 1975). pp. 17-30.

Dickson, George E., "Reform in Teacher Education through Developing Performance- (Competence) Based Teacher Education Programs," Innovation Now: International Perspectives on Innovation in Teacher Education. Proceedings of the 1972 ICET World Assembly, July 1972, London. Washington, D.C.: International Council on Education for Teaching, 1972. pp. 50-60.

Dickson, George E., Gilbert F. Shearron, Gary E. Cooke and Nancy Hensel. Early Childhood Education and Competency-Based Teacher Education. Storrs, Conn.: University of Connecticut, National Leadership Institute, Teacher Education/Early Childhood, June 1973.

Gentry, Castelle, Richard Hersh, Hughes Moir and Howard Coron, "University of Toledo," in An Experiment in Planned Change. Jane Otten (ed.), Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973. pp. 34-45.

Inglis, Joan D. Educational Comment, 1972, Field-Based Teacher Education: Emerging Relationships. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1972.

Ishler, Richard E. (ed.), Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Potpourri of Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1974.

Nussel, Edward J., John F. Ahern, Dennis E. Hinkle and George E. Dickson. Educational Comment, 1971, The Ohio Model and the Multi-Unit School. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1971.

Saxe, Richard W. (ed.) Educational Comment, 1969, Contexts for Teacher Education. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1969.

Sikula, John P. (ed.) Educational Comment, 1973, Teacher Education for an Urban Setting. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1973.

Wiersma, William. "A Guide to Educational Specifications for a Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Program" in A Reader's Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Research Project Reports, 1969-1976

Dickson, George E. and others. Educational Specifications for a Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Program, Final Report, Volumes I and II. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969. Volume I, 247 pp., Volume II, 720 pp. ERIC Documents ED 025 457 and ED 025 456.

Dickson, George E. and others. The Feasibility of Educational Specifications for the Ohio Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Program. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970. 883 pp. ERIC Document ED 042 721.

Dickson, George E. and others. Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio, Final Report. U.S.O.E. Project No. 016221. Toledo: College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1972.

Dickson, George E., Richard W. Saxe and others. A Prospectus for a National Consortium of Competency-Based Teacher Education Developers--Strategies and Products for CBTE Development at The University of Toledo, Summary Report, U.S.O.E. Project No. 450026. Toledo: Center for Educational Research and Services, College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1974.

Dickson, George E. and Richard W. Saxe. Second Stage Teacher Center and CBTE Development and Implementation, Summary Report, Final Report U.S.O.E. Project No. PIR 6221A. Toledo: Center for Educational Research and Services, College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1974.

Dickson, George E. and Richard W. Saxe, Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio and Second Stage Teacher Center and CBTE Development and Implementation, Summary Report, U.S.O.E. Project No. PIR 6221A F5005 VM. Toledo: Center for Educational Research and Services, College of Education, The University of Toledo, 1976.

Articles

Dickson, George E., "CBTE: Its Origins and Its State," COP Bulletin 2, Vol. II, 1974-75. (New York: New Careers Training Laboratory, Queens College, 1974), 1-14.

Dickson, George E. "Teacher Education in Transition," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 2, No. 3, (Spring 1969), 13-21.

Dickson, George E. and Dennis E. Hinkle. "A Study of the Ohio Teacher Education Model," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 3, No. 3, (Spring 1970), 56-67.

Dickson, George E., "IGE as a Focus for Reorganizing Preservice and Inservice Teacher Education in Ohio," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 27. No. 3 (Fall 1976). (In press)

Gentry, Castelle, Thomas Dunn, Dennis Myers, Stuart Cohen, Marcia Mutterer, Darryl Yorke, Donna Dolinsky and Donald Beckwith, "For Want of an Assessment System, CBTE Programs are Lost," PBTE, Vol. 3, No. 3, (September 1974), 1, 2, 8-12.

Leonard, Leo., "Review of Competency Based Teacher Education," Educational Studies, Vol. 4, No. 2, (Winter 1973).

Utz, Robert T. and Leo D. Leonard, "Are Behavioral Objectives Antithetical to a Humanistic Approach in Education?" New Directions in Teaching, Vol. 3, No. 2, (Winter-Spring, 1972).